

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/770,673	01/29/2001		Shinichi Takahashi	041514-5106	5427		
9629	7590	02/24/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
		& BOCKIUS LLP	MENEFEE, JAMES A				
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	, – –			2929			

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/770,673	TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James A. Menefee	2828	·
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See	MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Office	ite extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplif	ying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · · · · ·		an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 as in the final rejection.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied applied on is a)	roved or b) disapproved by ti	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. Other:		Paul & SPERSIS	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment, in adding limitations drawn to the chip being separate from the guiding portions, does not in any way reduce or simplify the issues for appeal. Further, note that this proposed limitation does nothing to patentably distinguish from Kasuga; in Kasuga, the chips 4 and 5 are not the same as the guiding portions 21-24, and thus can be interpreted as separate. Merely saying that they are separate does not distinguish.